

Stubblebine 109755con-1

### R E M A R K S

To expedite prosecution, claims 52-55 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim 52 was rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by an article by Abadi and Tuttle titled "A Semantics for a Logic of Authentication." Applicant respectfully traverses, disagreeing with a number of the Examiner's assertions.

Taking, for example, the assertion that

Abadi et al. does in fact disclose a "freshness constrain period", the time period being the start time of the authentication to the current time, and only timestamps that fall within this period may be considered "fresh." (page 9, lines 4-7 of the current Office Action)

To the extent that the Examiner is stating that Abadi et al accept any statement as fresh as long as it is more recent than the start time of the authentication, that is correct. However, such an arrangement does not define any period. Applicant appreciates that the Examiner perceives the word "period" correctly, as a concept whose synonyms are duration, epoch, generation, interval, span spell, stretch, term, and while. Also, one can consider that a period of time has elapsed from the start time of the authentication to the current time, but one cannot think of such an elapsed time interval as a specification of a period, because it continually changes as the current time changes. There is no statement that is created by anything in Abadi et al that specifies a period (duration, interval, span, etc.). Rather, what the reference teaches is just specifying the start time of the authentication, *which can be the beginning instance for a period*; but since there is no end time specified, there is no period that is specified. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 56, even before its current amendment, was not anticipated by the reference.

The above notwithstanding, in further effort to expedite prosecution -- and not in an effort to overcome the prior art -- claim 56 is amended. As amended, claim 56 specifies a private network, a public network, four separate servers and a user computer. None of these elements are found in the Abadi et al reference, except for server S and users A and B. Additionally, the claim specifies a long-term policy and a short term policy that are used to create an identification certificate and a validity statement, respectively. Additionally still, the validity statement is updated at specified intervals. None of that is taught or suggested by the Abadi et al reference. Moreover, the claim makes it more explicit that the freshness constraint is "represented by a time duration

Stubblebine 109755con-1

referenced to time of said request by said user computer;" and that is totally different from a start time of the authentication to the current time.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully submits that all of the Examiner's rejections have been overcome. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

Dated: 12/11/07

Respectfully,  
Stuart Gerald Stubblebine  
By Henry Brendzel  
Henry T. Brendzel  
Reg. No. 26,844  
Phone (973) 467-2025  
Fax (973) 467-6589  
email [brendzel@comcast.net](mailto:brendzel@comcast.net)